



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/307,620	05/07/1999		L. JAMES HWANG	X-409-US	5100
24309	7590	02/19/2004		EXAMINER	
XILINX, INC				HONG, STEPHEN S	
ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT 2100 LOGIC DR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA 95124				2178	19
				DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004	(

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

#

	Application N .	Applicant(s)	T
Advisory Action	09/307,620	HWANG, L. JAMES	•
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Stephen S. Hong	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears n the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	_
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this 1) a timely filed amendmer	application. A proper reply to a t which places the application in	
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mail			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	e later than SIX MONTHS from th	e mailing date of the final rejection.	In
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	I of extension and the correspond of the shortened statutory period f ffice later than three months after	ing amount of the fee. The appropriate extension reply originally set in the final Office action; or	n
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or se	arch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by	y materially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without canceNOTE:	eling a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed amendment	
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: S		considered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	· · · ·	•	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b)☐ disapprove	ed by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	
10. Other:		00	

STEPHENS. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: since the arguments are not persuasive, as the rejection is based on what the references, considered as a whole, taught and suggested. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).